

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
DOWNTOWN LIVABILITY  
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES

July 17, 2013  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Room 1E-108

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aaron Laing, Ernie Simas, co-chairs; Patrick Bannon, Mark D'Amato, Hal Ferris, Gary Guenther, Brad Helland, Trudi Jackson, Loretta Lopez, Lee Maxwell, Erin Powell, Jan Stout, Ming Zhang

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Chaplin, David Sutherland

OTHERS PRESENT: Dan Stroh, Emil King, Patti Wilma, Chris Salomone, Department of Planning and Community Development

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF JUNE 19 MINUTES

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. Helland. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stout and it carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Bannon. The motion was seconded by Mr. Helland.

Ms. Stout called attention to the paragraph just prior to the break on page 10 and suggested the sentence "The 800 children under the age of 18 living in the Downtown are the equivalent of two elementary schools, a middle school and a half, and nearly a high school..." should be revised to read "The 800 children under the age of 18 living in the Downtown are the equivalent of two elementary schools, or a middle school, or half of a high school...."

Ms. Stout also referred to the first paragraph after the break on page 10 and suggested that the word "course" should be changed to "coarse."

Co-chair Laing called attention to the second sentence of the middle paragraph on page 13 and asked to have the phrase "...FAR and zoning is all just made up and is really nothing more than an exercise on paper..." revised to read "FAR and zoning are legal constructs and nothing more than an exercise on paper...."

The motion maker and seconder accepted the proposed revisions to the minutes.

The motion carried unanimously.

## 2. INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members introduced themselves by name.

## 3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Diana Thompson, 3115 103rd Avenue NE, opposed allowed additional building height at the edge of the Downtown district, particularly along NE 12th Street. The more intense development there is along the edges of the Downtown district, the more there will be pressure to increase the size of the Downtown district, and thus the neighborhoods will not be protected from urban growth. Additional height in the Downtown could also yield more density in terms of the number of people living and working in that area. Increased density will result in increased traffic, especially on Bellevue Way, and that will negatively affect residential neighborhoods. She said her street is close to SR-520 and traffic at the end of the day often backs up on Bellevue Way northbound. The Downtown should be friendly for seniors. Small pocket parks throughout the Downtown would be really nice, as would benches liberally located. Affordable housing and a Downtown circulator would also benefit seniors.

Mr. Ross Klinger with Kidder Mathews said the market in Downtown Bellevue is currently very dynamic. Developers from both the east and west coasts have determined that Bellevue is a top three market. To accommodate the demand, larger floor plates should be allowed in the Downtown core. In District A on the south side of Main Street the 55-foot height limit is measured by the average height of the land, which means that further to the east on the south side of Main Street it is not possible to develop a five-over-one development because of the height difference. District A is the only subdistrict that does not allow hotels as a permitted residential use; the use is allowed in Districts B and C as a residential use. In Seattle a lot of land is being sold to developers for medium-density residential. Seattle permits five-over-two construction, but in Bellevue the zoning code only allows for five-over-one construction. The Seattle approach should be adopted by Bellevue. Overall, the more density allowed the better.

Mr. Warren Koons spoke on behalf of the Bellevue Downtown Association Land Use and Livability Committee. He urged the advisory committee members to consider a district-by-district approach to the amenity system. Amenities that are desirable in one district may not be desirable in another. The committee should also consider that the need for certain amenities can change over time. To fully understand what is working and what is not working in the Downtown, the committee should consider seeking feedback from the stakeholders who have direct development experience in working with the Code. Consideration should also be given to looking at what other cities are doing that is working well. He thanked the committee and the staff for participating in the Downtown Parking Forum convened by the BDA. Clearly the fact that 42 people attended a meeting that started at 7:30 a.m. on a Friday morning can be interpreted to mean there is a level of interest in the complex issue.

Mr. Jeff Calbert spoke representing Legacy Commercial, owner of three buildings in the DT-Office/Limited Business/Convention-Civic district. He said the tenancy in that district is made up of mortgage companies, title companies, banks, civil engineering firms, commercial and residential real estate firms. The unifying factor for such service businesses is parking. While it is counterintuitive to consider additional parking to support the companies given the close proximity to the future light rail station, the businesses should be allowed the level of parking they need to continue serving their customers and remain in the DT-OLB district in the shadow of the Downtown.

Ms. Laurie Lyford, a resident near Main Street and Bellevue Way, said she has been attending the focus groups. She said the Land Use Code Audits in hard copy were handed out by the staff, but there has not been any discussion of it, nor has there been any invitation to attend the ongoing committee meetings. Residents who live near the Downtown are concerned about density. She said where she lives on Main Street there are three buildings that are going to be going up. One will have 369 units, another will have 280 units, and the third one will have more than 200. When asked, the staff indicated the increased density will not affect traffic, and that clearly is not a credible statement. Parking is vital for commerce and currently there is a lack of it. The Viewcrest neighborhood has never been mailed notice of the potential for an up-zoning in the northeast quadrant of the Downtown. It should be questioned why density should be increased if the city has already exceeded its growth management goals. The issue of affordable housing needs to be addressed with vigor.

#### 4. OVERVIEW OF JULY 9 & 10 OPEN HOUSE/FOCUS GROUPS

Planning Manager Emil King explained that the focus of the open house and focus groups was the draft Land Use Code audits the committee spent time at its June meeting reviewing. A focus group guide was developed to accompany the larger audit document. A set of specific questions related to each topic were developed to boil down each module and focus the discussions. Some 45 people attended over the course of the two days; one individual attended the events on both days. Of those who attended, 22 had not previously participated in the March focus groups.

A comment card was made available to all who attended. Many filled the card out while at the event. Those who took the cards with them were asked to return them by July 31. A full report covering all three of the open house/focus group events will be ready in August.

#### 5. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT LAND USE CODE AUDITS

##### *Building Height and Form, Amenity Incentive System, Design Guidelines,*

Co-chair Simas asked for comments from the group with regard to how to divide up the Downtown and how to treat each for planning purposes.

Mr. D'Amato said he had toured all of the districts. He said he originally walked the districts in 2003 as part of the study to update the Downtown Implementation Plan. At that time it was difficult to see the various boundaries and he said he questioned whether it made sense to have the Downtown broken up into so many little segments. He noted, however, that over the years he has begun to see the differentiations and has come to appreciate the fact that the diversity adds interest to the Downtown. The alternative of having everything the same would be boring.

Mr. Ferris concurred. He stressed that Bellevue is still a very young city, and the Downtown area is even younger than the city as a whole. It takes a long time for a city to develop its character; no one should expect it to blossom overnight. Even so, the Downtown does have distinct differences, and that is a good thing. It will be important going forward to avoid duplicating amenities and services in each of the nine districts because each district has its own needs.

Ms. Stout said she has lived on the fringe of the Downtown for 45 years and has come to recognize that each of the districts in the Downtown has a different personality and serves a different purpose. Going forward it will be important to preserve the differences among the districts.

Mr. Bannon said he remembers after having first read the Subarea Plan for the Downtown that the nine different districts were all just made up. He noted, however, that as he has come to better know the Downtown he has come to the conclusion that each area is in fact different. Some have matured faster than others and have developed a finer grain, but they are evidence of the level of work that went into the Downtown Subarea update and the design charrette that identified character opportunities for each district. The current process offers the opportunity to refine and calibrate the incentive system to provide for better identity and character in the distinct districts.

Ms. Maxwell said she lives in the neighborhood adjacent to what many refer to as the low rent district, a district that has yet to shine and be developed to its full potential. The Downtown Livability Initiative is the opportunity to specifically address the character of all of the neighborhoods and to make sure the design guidelines and the amenity system will enable some of the finer-grain actions that have yet to occur. She suggested that anyone who has not yet read through the design charrette manual should do so; while there is a great deal of information, all of it is fascinating.

Ms. Guenther suggested that the Land Use Code is not broken and the current focus is right on making tweaks not a complete overhaul. The wedding cake approach has been particularly successful, but there is a large landowner with holdings on the entertainment street who likely will not want to put in an entertainment use, so that district might need to be addressed.

Mr. Helland asked how the area to the east of I-405 relates to the work of the committee. He stressed that he was not trying to expand the scope of the study, but pointed out that much of that area has similar attributes and needs. Planning Director Dan Stroh said the

Comprehensive Plan calls it a special opportunity area and recognizes that its proximity to the Downtown, the fact that it has easy access, and the fact that it will be served by light rail, make it ripe for realizing opportunities down the road. There was discussion at the Council level as to whether or not the area should be included in the scope of the Downtown Livability Initiative, but the conclusion reached was that it should not be included but that the interplay of the area with the Downtown should be taken into consideration, particularly the notion that what happens in the Downtown could very well affect the future development of the area to the east of I-405.

Mr. Zhang commented that Bellevue has become a very international city. Growth and development is a fact and no one will be able to stop it. The focus needs to be on how future growth will be accommodated. The Downtown is a finite area with a limited amount of resources, particularly given that the north, west and south borders of the Downtown front residential areas. The only direction of expansion is east, though it will be ten to twenty years before that needs to occur. The wedding cake concept is solid, but the city is going to have to let the cake grow larger by expanding in an easterly direction. As growth occurs, livability will need to be created through the provision of more open space and other amenities, the exchange for which will need to be higher density. Ultimately people will need to have more choices relative to affordability and luxury.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Bannon, Co-chair Laing commented that thoughtful feedback from the committee members and the public stakeholders following the last meeting necessitated the last-minute change to the agenda. The fact is there is no one-size-fits-all scheme for the Downtown. The audits are set up to focus on what is working, what is not working, and the opportunities that exist, but if the committee just talks about the Downtown as an overall entity, the resulting blanket response will not be very helpful. Going forward, there needs to be more consideration paid to the nuances of the distinct districts within the Downtown.

Mr. D'Amato questioned the approach of drawing the district boundaries in perfect squares. He allowed that there is something very Bellevuesque about square lines, but suggested there may be reasons for drawing the lines in ways that make more sense. Co-chair Simas said the committee is charged with coming up with some alternatives to be presented ultimately to the Planning Commission, and the ideas could include redrawing the lines.

Ms. Jackson highlighted the need to avoid thinking about the Downtown as a combination of residents and businesses. Presently the Downtown provides a lot of services to residents who live outside of the Downtown, most of whom will for years into the future choose to drive their personal vehicles into the Downtown to access those services, and they will need to be able to park. If the Downtown of the future is going to include small business offering services to everyone, some provision for parking will need to be made.

Ms. Lopez said the uses along University Avenue in Palo Alto, California, are mostly small retail shops in one- or two-story buildings. The city has allowed for parking on the

side streets in three- or four-story structures. There are no high-rises.

Ms. Jackson added that Pasadena, California, has taken a similar approach. It has retained its old town look and feel while providing for plenty of parking for those who drive into the area for services and shopping.

Mr. Bannon agreed that parking is and will continue to be a big issue. It will need to be looked at in great deal as part of the work of the committee. There are potentially distinct choices to be made district by district depending on the uses.

Ms. Stout pointed out that there is a fairly large population of seniors living around and in Downtown Bellevue, and without adjacent parking many services and retail establishments cannot be accessed by them. Close attention needs to be paid to how to make the Downtown a multigenerational friendly place.

Mr. Ferris agreed with the need to provide access for all residents, but he stressed that the Downtown area will not for much longer look like a suburban city with plenty of surface parking. The trick will be in figuring out how to provide easy access to parking without the expectation of being able to park a car in front of a business. He said he could envision a future in which most people coming to the Downtown take the train or a bus rather than drive their single-occupant vehicle.

Ms. Maxwell said there are obvious amenities and design guidelines that will need to apply to all of the Downtown districts, but as the district build out there should be identifiable amenities and design guidelines that are specific to districts.

Mr. Guenther commented that the DT-OLB district along I-405 could serve as a gateway district with larger floorplate office buildings with higher density.

Ms. Maxwell observed that during August the staff will be working diligently on various topics. She suggested that there may be some opportunity for the committee members to meet informally in working groups to look specifically at the textures of the Downtown districts and to formulate some recommendations for the group as a whole to consider.

Co-chair Laing said staff and the co-chairs are working on a homework assignment for the committee to take on during August when the committee will not meet. He referenced the letter submitted by the Fortin Group that was included in the packet materials. Some of their points are empirical and go to what is working and not working, while other points are more aspirational. He also reminded the group of the comments made earlier by Mr. Klinger regarding the 55-foot height limit and the argument with regard to five stories of wood-frame construction over a one- or two-level concrete structure, and the comments in an earlier meeting by Mr. Ferris about the fact that few buildings are being constructed in the 65-foot to 125-foot height range for Fire Code and other reasons. If a developer can only go to 40 feet with a commercial project but can go to 55 feet with a residential project, the question is what the economics are and which if either project pencils out. There could be a disconnect between the allowed FAR and the

height limit, with the latter actually keeping developments from reaching the allowed FAR. Issues like those are what the committee members need to understand.

With regard to amenities, Co-chair Laing said many have pointed out the need to have more open space and pocket parks. Currently there is very little open space in the Downtown, particularly green space. He commented that there are still some parcels in the Downtown that are developed as strip centers, with single-story buildings and about half of the site dedicated to surface parking. For some types of services and businesses, there is value to having adjacent surface parking. The committee should look carefully at those areas and make a determination if the current development patterns are broken or not. Another issue the group should look at is whether or not the current provisions are forcing a set outcome regardless of the degree to which the city wants to see a variety of choices offered.

Mr. D'Amato suggested it would be helpful for the committee to understand why the land use district boundaries in the Downtown were drawn as they are, and also suggested the committee should address the logic of the boundaries.

Mr. Bannon voiced the view that an important part of getting to decisions about what should be changed will be a close look at a range of alternatives in a way that will allow the committee members to visualize outcomes.

Co-chair Simas commented that one of the sticking points is that the committee members are asking the staff to show them some alternatives while the staff are looking to the committee to recommend alternatives. The job of the committee is to identify alternatives for the staff to consider. The work of the staff is to take those alternatives, analyze them, and make recommendations back to the committee with regard to whether the alternatives would work or not. Mr. Stroh agreed and said the committee's conversation will help feed an alternatives workshop aimed at identifying a list of alternatives to be studied in more detail.

With regard to five-over-one construction, Co-chair Laing noted that given 15 feet for the first floor and ten feet for the five floors over the first floor, the overall height of the building will be 65 feet, which exceeds the 55-foot height limit.

Mr. Zhang said Bellevue allows five-over-one, but most cities have as a minimum five-over-two. The height needed for five-over-one is actually closer to 70 feet, and for five-over-two it is closer to 80 feet. The minimum development in the Downtown should be five-over-one. Allowing for more density accommodates the creation of open space and makes living units more affordable.

Mr. Ferris said requiring a 40-foot height limit across from single family makes perfect sense. He also said the committee should move away from the idea that everything will have a podium with retail on the ground floor because there is no way Bellevue will at any time in the future be able to support that much commercial space on the ground floor across the entire Downtown. Vancouver B.C has done a great job of concentrating their

retail on specific streets; people know that is where to go to get what they need. Just one block off of those streets the designs are all low-key, pedestrian-oriented, and have no commercial on the ground floor, and it works great. Consideration should be given to where retail should be concentrated, and to allow for ground-level residential stepped back from the sidewalk, which is softer and makes a nice transition to the surrounding neighborhoods. Within a 40-foot height limit there could be two-story townhouses with single units above; no elevator would be needed because the structure would only be three stories, and that would be an affordable way to deliver housing around the perimeter. He agreed that greater density on the eastern edge of the Downtown along I-405 should be allowed. A pedestrian bridge crossing the freeway could become an iconic feature. Creating an academic environment on the Wilburton side and connecting it with the Downtown via a tram across the freeway to the transit center would be a great idea.

Ms. Maxwell proposed developing some flexible amenities or design standards in the Perimeter Design District. She said a comprehensive preliminary design review process could weed out the bad stuff and come up with sensitive and important developments.

Ms. Jackson said she would not trust that a flexible approach would work. One purpose for having a code is to assure that the same rules will apply equally to everyone. She agreed the ground floor units should be residential and not commercial.

Ms. Maxwell said she lives on the edge of the Downtown and wants to have an array of neighborhood services available. One of the ways to do that will be to be more flexible in design, and to hold developers to the mark of stated policies, not a particular amenity or code. She said more height could be allowed in exchange for higher quality structures and finishes, and additional setback opportunities that would create some texture.

Mr. Guenther said it would be helpful to have a developer address the committee about the economics involved.

Mr. D'Amato said the guiding tenets of the Code should be predictability and fairness. At the same time, some of the restrictions in the Code rule out common sense. She said he would like to see a system of values that at some point would inject common sense into the design process. Who would do that and at what point along the way would need to be worked out.

Mr. Bannon said the risk under the existing Code is that if every property in the Downtown were to develop out to the maximums allowed, the outcome would be something people would not view favorably. The Code should be crafted to make it economically viable to redevelop parcels while at the same time allowing opportunity to vary height and density on any particular site in a way that will achieve the overall objectives of the Subarea Plan policies and making the Downtown more livable. He said he would like to see the committee presented with some alternatives that would yield great urban form and design and amenities.

Co-chair Laing pointed out that none of the committee members had voiced bulk and



height concerns relative to sites in the core of the Downtown; the concerns highlighted all have had to do with what happens along the edges, particularly those that abut single family neighborhoods. He said when the original Downtown plan was adopted the city accepted the proposition that it is okay to be much taller when providing residential units. If the concern regarding height is shading or shadowing residential neighborhoods, or the overall bulk and scale next to the neighborhoods, those impacts are the same whether the developments have residential or commercial uses in them. He questioned whether or not it makes sense to make a distinction between residential and commercial developments when it comes to determining allowed height. He agreed that it makes sense to keep building heights lower on the edges of the Downtown for all the reasons cited.

Commissioner Ferris pointed out that because residential developments are required to have windows in every room, they cannot have the same big fat floorplates that office buildings can have. Accordingly, a residential building and a commercial building of the exact same height will look a lot different, with the residential building being much narrower and will need more height to gain the same FAR.

Co-chair Laing noted that parcel size and configuration dictate to a large degree building modulation.

Mr. Bannon said he would like the committee to look at the potential equalization of residential and office relative to building height and what the effect would be on floorplate size.

Ms. Powell said she likes having nine distinct districts in the Downtown. There is, however, a lack of open space and each of the districts. One of the issues facing the Downtown is that there are no vacant properties over which developers are drooling and on which open space can be created. The questions of taxing the citizenry to obtain open space, or increasing the cost of development by requiring open space, are legitimate and should be addressed. The amount of open space needed for each district should be based on the projected density of the individual districts. In any event, open space needs to be identified and/or preserved sooner rather than later, regardless of the approach used to obtain it.

Co-chair Simas said there are a number of amenities developers can utilize to obtain additional FAR. It can be argued that additional FAR as an amenity in exchange for open space would be beneficial, and that would not require taxing the citizenry nor would it put an onerous cost on the developers.

Ms. Powell said a fee-in-lieu program could yield the funds needed to purchase land for open space.

Mr. Guenther commented that if a developer is brought in to talk about amenities and development costs the focus should be on generalities and not a specific project. With regard to equalizing the allowed height between residential and commercial projects, he said the market should be given some credit. Lot sizes differ in the Downtown and the

smaller lots will not support buildings with large floor plates.

Commissioner Ferris suggested Stephen O'Connor from the Runstad Center for Real Estate Studies at the University of Washington would be a good person to make a presentation to the committee.

Mr. Lopez concurred and suggested that would retain the appearance of fairness. To bring in any developer with ties to the Downtown could be viewed from the outside as an attempt to influence the committee toward a particular outcome. She also suggested the committee should refrain from thinking that developers alone have the responsibility for creating open space. Parks and Community Services Director Patrick Foran might be able to shed some light on funds the city might be able to use to create open space in the Downtown.

Mr. Zhang suggested sustainability should be incentivized. Some cities require minimum thresholds of sustainability for every new building. He suggested that because Bellevue calls itself a city in a park, it would make sense to require all new development to be LEED certified.

Mr. Ferris said the LEED Silver standard is easily achievable given the type of buildings constructed in Downtown Bellevue, whether they are residential or commercial. When the LEED standards were new, it was necessary to incentivize developers to strive for certification, but developers have adapted and are more inclined to seek the certification without incentives.

Mr. D'Amato suggested that amenities should be about giving something tangible back to the community. Sustainability is not tangible for the most part. He said he would prefer to see street lamps, flower boxes or open plazas in exchange for additional height.

Ms. Maxwell said parks and pocket parks are just two elements of open space. Great street design with trees will go a long way toward at least giving the allusion of open space in the Downtown. Mr. D'Amato agreed and pointed out that some cities form LIDs along streets as a means of funding landscaping efforts.

Co-chair Laing pointed out that the current amenity system gives developers four square feet of gross floor area for every one square foot of land donated for use as a park. That is the same ratio allowed for residential entry courtyards, above-grade parking under residential, arcades, and enclosed plazas. Not surprisingly, there has to date been no property donated for use as a park. He said he did not know what it would take to incentivize a large donation of property for a park. The committee might want to look at what it would really take to incentivize the donation of a meaningful amount of land in any district in the Downtown. He stressed, however, that the donation of land for parks, or fees in-lieu meant for parks, must be done in conjunction with an overall plan for developing the parks.

Mr. D'Amato highlighted the need for the city's amenity system to evolve over time and

be flexible to address current values and needs over time. It makes sense to accentuate the FAR bonus for contributing to parks while there is still open space that can be captured. He agreed there is no reason to collect money or land absent having a plan in place to for using it.

Ms. Jackson said a reading of the current list of amenities makes it clear that childcare services were more important than park land when the list was created. The fact is, as there are more workers and children in the Downtown, the market will step up to provide the childcare services. What is needed is a system predicated on values that can be modulated over time.

Commissioner Stout suggested it would be helpful for the committee to be provided with an inventory listing of all properties owned by the city inside the Downtown boundaries.

Co-chair Simas pointed out that very little focus had been given by the committee members to the core of the Downtown. He asked if there are issues to be focused on there, or if the primary concern is with the perimeter districts.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Bannon, Planning Manager Patti Wilma explained that in the late 1980s there was an effort launched by the single family residential neighborhoods surrounding the Downtown to get a better handle on development occurring within the perimeter districts. At the time there was no height limit in the core. A proposal was submitted to construct a 600-foot tower on the vacant Safeway site and that was the spark that led to expansion of the B district, the creation of the C district, and the establishing of a 450-foot maximum height limit.

Mr. Helland commented that the future creation of a freeway park over I-405 is something the city may want to consider. That would tie the Downtown to the areas east of the freeway where there may be opportunities to acquire properties for additional parks or green space.

Ms. Lopez concurred. She pointed out that the plan for the Spring District in the Bel-Red corridor includes a green space and the opening of the stream. A freeway park is one way the Downtown could be connected to the eastern part of the city.

Mr. Bannon said he would like to review the opportunities, based on the market, to allow height increases in perimeter districts and in the core. He said one option might be to allow an FAR super bonus in exchange for a developer doing something extraordinary to benefit the city. In responding to additional height, the market could in fact yield a better built form in the Downtown.

Mr. Guenther noted that at the first meeting the committee talked about achieving a more iconic skyline, and allowing for additional height is one way to go about it.

Ms. Maxwell observed that the current approach has building heights reducing toward the freeway. She said she would like to see what the impact of development would be if the

allowed 450-foot height limit were to be continued all the way to 112th Avenue NE.

Mr. Zhang pointed out that the 450-foot height limit is essentially urban scale. The next logical step would be to 600 feet. Often taller buildings are more efficient to construct, resulting in a lower unit cost.

Mr. Ferris commented that taller buildings usually end up being more slender and moved away from the sidewalk. They are also most often spaced apart from each other. Building mass and relationship to the street are practical considerations that will need to be addressed in looking at building height.

Ms. Maxwell observed that 112th Avenue NE is a very aggressive street, and building height in the DT-OLB along the street should be uniform and not increased over what is currently allowed. There is housing on the west side of 112th Avenue NE and the buildings in the DT-OLB are compatible.

Co-chair Simas asked the committee members to give careful thought to the current amenities on the list ahead of the next meeting in September.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Bannon, Mr. Stroh explained that alternatives will not be developed in isolation. The committee will develop alternatives in a workshop setting in conjunction with staff. Once a list of alternatives has been identified, each will be thoroughly analyzed by the staff and consultants. The committee will, however, need to complete its walk through of the various pieces before the alternatives workshop can be held.

Co-chair Simas opened the floor to comments from the public.

Mr. Carl Vander Hoek with the Vander Hoek Corporation suggested each of the nine Downtown districts should be renamed. The current names make no sense for anything other than planning purposes. He added that the 3-D models of the Downtown available through Google maps is a great tool that each of the committee members should be using. The question of allowing five-over-two construction should be answered. The best historians relative to why things are the way they are in the Downtown are the community leaders, property owners and residents who participated in the original conversations. The idea of having park land in each of the four corners has merit, though finding the land would be the difficult part without burdening the developers. When it comes to building affordable housing, the focus should be on the area to the south of the Downtown. A discussion of city utilities and technology infrastructure should be conducted as part of the study. Heights are supported by achievable rents. The committee members were urged not to forget to address the issue of parcel boundaries.

Mr. Stu Vander Hoek, 9 - 103rd Avenue NE, complemented the committee members for the quality conversation. He pointed out that while an aerial photo in the staff presentation shows single family residential on the south side of the Downtown line, there is in fact no single family zoning there; it is all R-30. In most cases, R-30 buildings

can be taller than what can be achieved with the Perimeter Design District zoning. With regard to parks, he said he would like to see the committee shown figures relating to the percentage of existing developed park properties and undeveloped park properties as a ratio of Downtown workers and Downtown residents and compare the findings to other cities of similar size. It might be discovered that Bellevue has more park land in its Downtown than any other place in the world. Maybe type and location of park land should be the focus rather than more park land.

5. NEXT STEPS

Co-chair Simas said the next committee meeting would be on September 18.

6. ADJOURN

Co-chair Simas adjourned the meeting at 9:19 p.m.